

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #:
DATE FILED: 9/11/2020

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

JORGE DANIEL GOMEZ,

Plaintiff,

-against-

HENRY STREET SETTLEMENT; RENEE
BEST; PRISCILLA DELSOL-HILL,

Defendants.

20 Civ. 5585 (AT)

ORDER OF SERVICE

ANALISA TORRES, United States District Judge:

Plaintiff brings this *pro se* action under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (“Title VII”), 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17, alleging that his employer discriminated against him based on his race. Plaintiff may also be asserting related state-law claims. *See McLeod v. Jewish Guild for the Blind*, 864 F.3d 154, 158 (2d Cir. 2017) (holding that where a *pro se* plaintiff’s factual allegations supported claims under “well-known” provisions of state law, district courts must construe the complaint as asserting claims under those laws, “regardless of [plaintiff’s] failure to check the appropriate blank on a form complaint”). By order dated September 10, 2020, the Court granted Plaintiff’s request to proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP).

DISCUSSION

A. Service on Defendants

Because Plaintiff has been granted permission to proceed IFP, he is entitled to rely on the Court and the U.S. Marshals Service to effect service. *Walker v. Schilt*, 717 F.3d. 119, 123 n.6 (2d Cir. 2013); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d) (“The officers of the court shall issue and serve all process . . . in [IFP] cases.”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(3) (the court must order the Marshals Service to serve if the plaintiff is authorized to proceed IFP)). Although Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure generally requires that the summonses and complaint be served within 90 days

of the date the complaint is filed, Plaintiff is proceeding IFP and could not have served the summonses and complaint until the Court reviewed the complaint and ordered that summonses be issued. The Court therefore extends the time to serve until 90 days after the date the summonses are issued. If the complaint is not served within that time, Plaintiff should request an extension of time for service. *See Meilleur v. Strong*, 682 F.3d 56, 63 (2d Cir. 2012) (holding that it is the plaintiff's responsibility to request an extension of time for service); *see also Murray v. Pataki*, 378 F. App'x 50, 52 (2d Cir. 2010) ("As long as the [plaintiff proceeding IFP] provides the information necessary to identify the defendant, the Marshals' failure to effect service automatically constitutes 'good cause' for an extension of time within the meaning of Rule 4(m).").

To allow Plaintiff to effect service on Defendants Henry Street Settlement, Renee Best, and Priscilla DelSol-Hill through the U.S. Marshals Service, the Clerk of Court is instructed to fill out a U.S. Marshals Service Process Receipt and Return form ("USM-285 form") for each of these Defendants. The Clerk of Court is further instructed to issue summonses and deliver to the Marshals Service all the paperwork necessary for the Marshals Service to effect service upon these Defendants.

Plaintiff must notify the Court in writing if his address changes, and the Court may dismiss the action if Plaintiff fails to do so.

CONCLUSION

The Clerk of Court is directed to mail a copy of this order to Plaintiff, together with an information package.

The Clerk of Court is further instructed to issue summonses, complete the USM-285 forms with the addresses for Henry Street Settlement, Renee Best, and Priscilla DelSol-Hill and deliver all documents necessary to effect service to the U.S. Marshals Service.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 11, 2020
New York, New York



ANALISA TORRES
United States District Judge

DEFENDANTS AND SERVICE ADDRESSES

1. Henry Street Settlement
265 Henry Street
New York, New York 10002
2. Renee Best
c/o Henry Street Settlement
265 Henry Street
New York, New York 10002
3. Priscilla DelSol-Hill
c/o Henry Street Settlement
265 Henry Street
New York, New York 10002